

Appl. No.: 10/714,041
Reply to Office Action of: November 17, 2004

Remarks

Claims 1-12 pending in the application. Claims 11 and 12 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-10 stand rejected. The following remarks are addressed to the referenced paragraphs of the Office Action dated November 17, 2004.

Specification

The title has been objected to, as not being descriptive of the invention. Applicants have amended the title herein to "Connector Arrangement For Symmetrical Transmission Of Time-Variable Differential Signals." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully contend that this objection has been traversed.

Claim Objections

Claims 2-10 are objected to because they reference A connector" rather than "The connector." Applicants have amended the subject claims to correct this informality.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 6 is canceled herein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully contend that this objection has been traversed.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by Holt (U.S. 5,478,254).

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by De La Cruz et al. (US Pat. No. 6,616,482).

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 1 is allowable because it includes a feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references, namely "each core pair is arranged

Appl. No.: 10/714,041
Reply to Office Action of: November 17, 2004

approximately equidistantly relative to each core end and the associated contact elements of at least one of the other core pairs." The Office Action suggests that the wires 15, 17 of Holt are core pairs and are arranged equidistantly relative to each core end and the associated contact elements 28 and 30 of at least one of the other core pairs. Applicants respectfully disagree. Holt discloses only a plurality of wires 15 and 17. Nowhere does Holt suggest core pairs. Moreover, Holt is silent regarding the spatial relationship of the wires 15 and 17, and therefore cannot disclose or suggest the specific spatial relationship of a core pair being equidistant from each core end and associated contact element of another core pair.

De La Cruz et al. fail to provide what Holt lacks, namely the spatial relationship of core pair being equidistant from each core end and the associated contact element of at least one of the other core pairs. The Office Action suggests that Figures 1 and 4 show each core pair 4 being arranged equidistantly relative to each core and the associated contact element of at least one of the other core pairs. Applicants respectfully disagree. Neither Figure 1 nor Figure 4 identifies the core pairs. Thus, De La Cruz cannot disclose or suggest the specific spatial relationship of a core pair being equidistant from each core end and associated contact element of another core pair.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully contend that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-5 and 7-10 depend from claim 1, and Applicants respectfully contend that they are allowable for the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6, 7, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a), as being unpatentable over Holt (US Pat. No. 5,478,254).

Appl. No.: 10/714,041
Reply to Office Action of: November 17, 2004

Claim 6 has been canceled. Claims 7 and 10 depend from claim 1 and Applicants respectfully contend that they are allowable for the reason that claim 1 is allowable.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully contend that the Office Action has failed to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness as no motivation is provided to make the suggested modifications.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and arguments presented herein, the application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and passage to issue is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayments associated with this application to Deposit Order Account No. 501581.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven E. Bach
Registration No. 46,530
Attorney for Applicants
Phone: 610.889.3697
Facsimile: 610.889.3696
PTO Customer No.: 29450